



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/576,412

05/22/2000

Gilles Lisimaque

032326-025

1838

21839

7590

12/23/2003

BURNS DOANE SWECKER & MATHIS L L P

POST OFFICE BOX 1404

ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1404

EXAMINER

WU, ALLEN S

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2135

DATE MAILED: 12/23/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/576,412

Applicant(s)

LISIMAQUE, GILLES

Examiner

Allen S. Wu

Art Unit

2131

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 May 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 22 May 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☒ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 4. 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

1. Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority based on an application filed in France on 11/25/1997. It is noted, however, that applicant has not filed a certified copy of the 97/14802 application as required by 35 U.S.C. 119(b).

Information Disclosure Statement

2. The information disclosure statement filed May 22, 2000 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(3) because it does not include a concise explanation of the relevance, as it is presently understood by the individual designated in 37 CFR 1.56(c) most knowledgeable about the content of the information, of each patent listed that is not in the English language. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 8-11 and 13 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

5. Claim 8 recites the limitation "this second management code" in line 3 of claim.

There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Art Unit: 2131

6. Claim 9 recites the limitation "these data" in line 2 of claims. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
7. Claim 10 recites the limitation "allows this" in line 5 of claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
8. Claim 12 recites the limitation "the data" in line 1 of claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
9. Claim 13 recites the limitation "the data" in line 2 of claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. Claims 1-6 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Campana et al, US Patent 5,602,915, in view of Peyret et al.

As per claim 1, Campana et al discloses a first management code (secret number, col 4 ln 8-19) is produced with a first cryptographic algorithm (D1, col 4 ln 8-19) based on a mother key (secret key G, col 4ln 8-19) and a first set of identification data of the first chip card (ID1, col 4 ln 8-19), this first management

code is recorded in the first memory (col 4 ln 8-19; It is noted that Campana et al does not explicitly teach recording in the first memory. However, this calculation is done on the card itself. The result of the calculation of the management code must be written somewhere in the card. Therefore, recording the management code is to be inherent to the teachings of Campana et al.). The first card is linked to a chip card reader (smart card reader, col 1 ln 13-20).

Campana et al further discloses editing of data stored in the first memory (writing... secret key, col 2 ln 17-35; col 4 ln 7-28). However, Campana et al does not disclose authorizing the editing of data stored in the first memory if a secret code presented to the reader is compatible with the first management code recorded. Peyret et al discloses editing of memory (access... memory, page 748 paragraph 3) if a secret code (page 748 paragraphs 3-4) is compatible with a management code (Secret Code, page 748 paragraphs 3-4). One of ordinary skill in the art would have modified the editing step of Campana et al's teachings to incorporate a comparing step before editing is performed. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to combine the teachings of Peyret et al within the system of Campana et al because it would have heightened security. The step of comparing two forms of identification data before performing a task is well known in the art to provide authentication of the user before action is taken. Furthermore, the Campana et al does not explicitly disclose supplying a secret code to a card reader. Peyret et al discloses supplying a secret code to a card reader from the input (secret

code...presented, page 748 paragraphs 3-5). One would have modified the teachings of Campana et al so that the secret code before editing is done. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to combine the teachings of Peyret et al within the system of Campana because it would have heightened security. A user who supplies the correct secret code to the card reader is inherently authenticating himself as an authorized user of the card.

Campana et al further discloses a second management code (NS, col 3 In 48-67) is produced with a second cryptographic algorithm (D2, col 3 In 48-67) based on data relating to the first card (ID1, col 3 In 48-67) and a second set of identification data of a second chip card (ID2, col 3 In 48-67), and data relating to the first card (ID1, col 3 In 48-67) and the second management code (NS, col 3 In 48-67) recorded in a second memory of a second chip of the second chip card (passed from one card to another, col 3 In 39-67; It is noted that Campana et al does not explicitly disclose recording in a second memory. However, a second chip card receives the identification data from the first chip card. Also, the second chip card produces the management code. Since the cryptographic algorithm is done on the card and the data relating to the first card is supplied to the second card, the data relating to the first card and the second management code must be recorded into the second chip card so that the data relating to the first card and the second management code can be used for their respective

purposes. Therefore, recording in a second memory is to be inherent to the teachings of Campana et al.).

Campana further discloses editing of the data stored in the second memory (writing...secret key, col 2 ln 17-35; col 3 ln 4 ln 48-67). However Campana et al does not teach editing is authorized if a secret code presented to the reader is compatible with the second management code recorded.

Furthermore, Campana et al does not disclose authorizing the editing of data stored in the first memory if a secret code presented to the reader is compatible with the first management code recorded. Peyret et al discloses editing of memory (access...memory, page 748 paragraph 3) if a secret code (page 748 paragraphs 3-4) is compatible with a management code (Secret Code, page 748 paragraphs 3-4). One of ordinary skill in the art would have modified the editing step of Campana et al's teachings to incorporate a comparing step before editing is performed. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to combine the teachings of Peyret et al within the system of Campana et al because it would have heightened security. The step of comparing two forms of identification data before performing a task is well known in the art to provide authentication of the user before action is taken.

Furthermore, the Campana et al does not explicitly disclose supplying a secret code to a card reader. Peyret et al discloses supplying a secret code to a card reader from the input (secret code...presented, page 748 paragraphs 3-5). One would have modified the teachings of Campana et al so that the secret code

before editing is done. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to combine the teachings of Peyret et al within the system of Campana because it would have heightened security. A user who supplies the correct secret code to the card reader is inherently authenticating himself as an authorized user of the card.

As per claim 2, Campana et al further discloses the first (NS col 4 ln 8-19) and second management codes (NA, col 3 ln 56-67) are secret codes (secret number, col 4 ln 56-67 and col 4 ln 8-19).

As per claim 3, Campana et al further discloses second algorithm is implemented in the chip of the card (D2D2 written in the smart card, col 3 ln 48-67).

As per claim 4, Campana et al further discloses a first cryptographic algorithm (D1, col 4 ln 7-28) and a second cryptographic algorithm (D2 col 3 ln 56-67) and the second cryptographic algorithm being symmetric (generate using group secret key, col 3 ln 56-67; It is noted that Campana et al does not explicitly state a symmetric algorithm. However, the use of secret keys in a cryptographic algorithm is inherently a symmetric algorithm. The keys are secret and only that secret key can be used to encrypt and decrypt by parties involved). Campana et al does not explicitly teach the first and second cryptographic algorithms being different. Peyret et al further discloses changing cryptographic algorithms by

changing smart cards (page 749, paragraphs 7-9). One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have modified the cryptographic algorithm on the second chip card to use a different cryptographic algorithm. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to combine the teachings of Peyret et al within the system of Campana et al because it would have prevented vulnerability of reverse engineering due to the repeated use of similar cryptographic algorithms.

As per claim 5, Campana et al further discloses first cryptographic algorithm is the same as the second cryptographic algorithm (D1 and D2...identical to each other, col 4 ln 20-27).

As per claim 6, Campana et al further discloses the data relating to the first card (ID1, col 3 ln 39-46) is the first set of identification data of the first card or the first chip (identification code...for card C1, col 3 ln 39-46).

As per claim 8, Campana et al further discloses a management code word (NS1, col 3 ln 48-55) being produced in the reader on the basis of the data relating to the first card (ID1, col 3 ln 48-67). Campana et al does not teach a determination of whether the card is authentic if the management code word is compatible with a secret word. Peyret et al discloses determination of whether the card is authentic (will not grant access, page 748 paragraphs 3-5) if the

management code word (access Secret Code, page 748 paragraphs 3-5) is compatible with a secret word (supplied Secret Code, page 748 paragraphs 3-5). One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have modified the teachings of Campana et al to add a determination step in determining the authenticity of a card. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to combine the teachings of Peyret et al within the system of Campana et al because it would have heightened security by providing passive card security through the use of secret codes.

13. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Campana et al, US Patent 5,602,915, in view of Peyret et al as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Diehl et al, US Patent 5,162,638.

As per claim 7, the combination of Campana et al discloses data relating to the first card (ID1, col 3 ln 39-67). However, the combination of Campana et al and Peyret et al does not explicitly teach the data relating to the first card being the first management code of the first card or the first chip. Diehl et al discloses managing data of chip cards for replacement (abstract) including transferring management code (code identifying the card, col 2 ln 28-36) to a second card (col 2 ln 37-64). One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have modified the data relating to the first card to be the management code of the first card or first chip instead of identification data of the

first card or first chip. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to combine the teachings of Diehl et al within the combination of Campana et al and Peyret et al because it would have enhanced the authenticity of data on the second card. Writing the first management code of the first card or the first chip in the second memory of the second card or second chip would have created a chaining of the new card with the old card.

14. Claims 9-11 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Campana et al, US Patent 5,602,915, in view of Peyret et al as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Drupsteen, US Patent 6,073,238.

As per claim 9, Campana et al discloses data stored in first memory (secret key, col 2 ln 18-35), editing of the data stored in the first card (writing...secret key, col 2 ln 17-35; col 4 ln 7-28), copying data into the second memory (ID1, col 3 ln 29-59), and producing a second secret code when copying the data (NS2, col 3 ln 39-67).

The combination of Campana et al and Peyret et al does not disclose a transmission attribute associated with the data stored in the first memory. Drupsteen discloses storing the data with a transmission attribute (flag register, col 4 ln 17-39). One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have modified the combination of Campana et al and Peyret et al to further associate a transmission attribute with data stored in the first memory.

Both the combination of Campana et al and Peyret et al and Drupsteen discloses a method of managing data in a chip card and transmission of data from a card. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to combine the teachings of Drupsteen within the combination of Campana et al and Peyret et al because it would have added flexibility to the chip card. The addition of attributes can allow the chip card to perform certain commands depending on the attribute.

Furthermore, Campana et al does not disclose the authorization of editing the data stored in the first memory. Peyret et al discloses editing of data stored in a card after the card is authenticated (page 748 paragraphs 3-4). One of ordinary skill in the art would have modified the editing step of Campana et al's teachings to incorporate an authentication step before editing is performed. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to combine the teachings of Peyret et al within the system of Campana et al because it would have heightened security. The step of comparing two forms of identification data before performing a task is well known in the art to provide authentication of the user before action is taken. The combination of Campana et al and Peyret et al does not disclose editing of the data stored in the first memory is authorized so that they can be copied into the second memory depending on the value of this attribute. Drupsteen discloses the use of attributes to specify commands to be processed (col 5 ln 17-39). One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have used

an attribute to determine whether editing of the data is authorized. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to combine the teachings of Drupsteen within the combination of Campana et al and Peyret et al because it would have added flexibility to the chip card. The addition of attributes in a chip card allows one to modify or add commands to the card by modifying the attributes and not the commands themselves.

Furthermore, Campana et al discloses copying data into memory as described above. The combination of Campana et al and Peyret et al does not teach copying of the attribute into the second memory. Drupsteen discloses copying of the attribute into a memory (flag register associated with master file, fig 4, col 5 ln 17-39). Both an attribute and data are digital data that can be stored in a memory together. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to combine the teachings of Drupsteen within the combination of Campana et al and Peyret et al because it would have added flexibility to the chip card. The addition of attributes in a chip card allows one to modify or add commands to the card by modifying the attributes and not the commands themselves. By copying the attributes into a second card with the data from the first memory, attributes from the first card are kept the same.

Furthermore, Campana et al discloses creating a secret code as described above. However, the combination of Campana et al and Peyret et al

does not teach an attribute giving information about a need to create a secret code when copying data. Drupsteen discloses the use of attributes to specify commands to be processed (col 5 ln 17-39). One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have modified the secret code creation command of the combination of Campana et al and Peyret et al to incorporate an attribute to provide information on the need to produce a secret code. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to combine the teachings of Drupsteen within the combination of Campana et al and Peyret et al because it would have added flexibility to the chip card. The addition of attributes in a chip card allows one to modify or add commands to the card by modifying the attributes and not the commands themselves.

As per claim 10, Campana et al discloses editing of data contained in the first memory (writing...secret key, col 2 ln 17-35; col 4 ln 7-28). However, Campana et al does not teach to authorize editing of data contained in the first memory only under the control of a master system. Peyret et al discloses the authorization of editing of data only under control of a master system (TV Operator, page 747 paragraph 7-9). One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have modified the teachings of Campana et al do only allow editing by control of a master system. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to combine

the teachings of Peyret et al within the system of Campana et al because it would have added flexibility to the system of Campana et al. Allowing editing through control of a master system insures that only one system is editing the data so that system can edit the data in any way without others editing the card as well.

Furthermore, the combination of Campana et al and Peyret et al does not teach a transmission attribute which gives information about a need for this control by a master system is associated. Drupsteen discloses the use of attributes to specify commands to be processed (col 5 ln 17-39). One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have used an attribute to determine whether editing of the data is authorized. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to combine the teachings of Drupsteen within the combination of Campana et al and Peyret et al because it would have added flexibility to the chip card. The addition of attributes in a chip card allows one to modify or add commands to the card by modifying the attributes and not the commands themselves.

Furthermore, the combination of Campana et al and Peyret et al does not teach this attribute being read prior to editing. Drupsteen discloses reading the attributes before processing a command (col 5 ln 17-28). One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have modified the combination of Campana et al and Peyret et al so that an attribute is read before data on the card is edited. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to combine the teachings of

Drupsteen within the combination of Campana et al and Peyret et al because it would have heightened security. Reading an attribute before processing a command or program allows the combination to inhibit editing depending on the attribute.

Campana et al discloses an editing program (customization phase, col 2 ln 23-35). However, the combination of Campana et al and Peyret et al does not teach an editing program is started if the attribute having been read allows this. Drupsteen discloses the use of attributes to inhibit or allow certain commands to be processed (col 5 ln 17-35). Drupsteen and the combination of Campana et al and Peyret et al disclose the use of chip cards and transferring data between cards. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have modified the combination of Campana et al and Peyret et al to incorporate an attribute to control the start of programs. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to combine the teachings of Drupsteen within the combination of Campana et al and Peyret et al because it would have heightened security. Using attributes allows the system the combination to inhibit the execution of a command. Therefore, unwanted commands or programs will not start if the attribute is set to a certain value.

As per claim 11, Campana et al discloses data concerned with being copied (col 2 ln 23-35 and col 4 ln 7-19). Campana et al does not teach a view to

the data concerned being copied. Peyret et al discloses a display of data (fingerprinting, page 749 paragraphs 5-6). Displaying data is a method that is well known in the art. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have used the display of Peyret to provide a view of the data concerned with being copied from the teachings of Campana et al. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to combine the teachings of Peyret et al within the system of Campana et al because it would have heightened security. By providing a view of the data concerned being copied, one can have more information on the data to decide whether or not the card is authentic.

Furthermore, the combination of Campana et al and Peyret et al does not teach the transmission attribute inhibits editing. Drupsteen discloses the use of attributes to inhibit or allow certain commands to be processed (col 5 ln 17-35). Drupsteen and the combination of Campana et al and Peyret et al disclose the use of chip cards and transferring data between cards. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have modified the combination of Campana et al and Peyret et al to incorporate an attribute to control the start of programs. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to combine the teachings of Drupsteen within the combination of Campana et al and Peyret et al because it would have heightened security. Using attributes allows the system the

combination to inhibit the execution of a command. Therefore, unwanted commands or programs will not start if the attribute is set to a certain value.

As per claim 13, Campana discloses the use of smart cards for certain applications (fax machines, col 1 ln 13-20). However, the combination of Campana et al and Peyret et al does not explicitly teach the card being multi-application card. Drupsteen et al discloses a card for use with multiple applications (ith application, col 5 ln 1-16). Chip cards have processors, which can be programmed to handle many different commands or programs. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have programmed the chip card to be used for multiple applications. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to combine the teachings of Drupsteen within the system of Campana et al and Peyret et al because it would have added flexibility to a card user. Using one card for multiple applications would allow the user to avoid carrying a different card for each application.

Furthermore, Campana et al discloses management codes (NS, col 3 ln 56-59). The combination of Campana et al and Peyret et al does not teach the data being associated with respective management codes. Drupsteen discloses respective management codes for each application (K3*, col 5 ln 1-16). Chip cards contain processors, which can be programmed for different tasks. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have

modified the combination of Campana et al and Peyret et al so incorporate different management codes for each application. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to combine the teachings of Drupsteen within the combination of Campana et al and Peyret et al because it would have heightened security. The use of respective management codes will insure that one the data pertaining to certain applications are processed.

15. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Campana et al, US Patent 5,602,915, in view of Peyret et al, further in view of Drupsteen, US Patent 6,073,238 as applied to claim 9 above, and further in view of Diehl, US Patent 5,162,638.

As per claim 12, Campana et al discloses the data being copied into the memory (writing... secret key, col 2 ln 17-35; col 4 ln 7-28). However, the combination of Campana et al, Peyret et al, and Drupsteen does not teach the data being copied into the memory in delayed time. Diehl discloses copying data into memory in delayed time (col 2, ln 36-64). One ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have modified the combination of Campana et al, Peyret et al, and Drupsteen to write to memory in delayed time. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to combine the teachings of Diehl within the combination of Campana et al, Peyret et al, and Drupsteen because it would have

decreased the amount of hardware needed for the combination. Writing to memory in delayed time allows for the use of one card reader/writer.

Conclusion

16. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Wratil, US Patent 5,298,724, discloses configuring chip cards with authentication before editing of the cards.

Drupsteen et al, US Patent 5,856,659, discloses transferring of data to other cards through the use of management codes of identification data.

Bjerrum et al, EP Patent 04,02,301, discloses a method of transferring data to and from smart cards.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Allen S. Wu whose telephone number is 703-305-0708. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on 703-305-9648. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is N/A.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-0900.


GREGORY MORSE
Allen S. Wu SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Application/Control Number: 09/576,412

Page 20

Art Unit: 2131

Examiner
Art Unit 2131

ASW